

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 were pending in the present application. Claims 1-18 are withdrawn in view of Examiner's restriction requirement dated April 18, 2008. Claims 20 and 21 are amended. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Applicant acknowledges that the Examiner indicated that claims 19-28 are allowable.

The Examiner rejected claims 29-31 and 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0073977 ("Vanghi '977"). The Examiner objected to claim 32 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully traverses Examiner's rejections.

As an initial matter, the present application's filing date of February 18, 2004 antedates Vanghi '977's filing date of February 24, 2004. Vanghi '977 does claim priority to U.S. Provisional Pat. Appl. 60/508,452 ("Vanghi '452"), which has a filing date of October 2, 2003, but the content of Vanghi '452 is quite different from the content of Vanghi '977. For example, while the Examiner points to several elements in Vanghi '977 figure 2 as disclosing elements of Applicant's claims, there is no such figure in Vanghi '452. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner provide specific citations to Vanghi '452 should the Examiner continue to cite Vanghi '977 against Applicant's pending claims.

In any case, Vanghi '977 (and Vanghi '452) do not teach or suggest all the elements of Applicant's independent claim 29. Claim 29 recites that "the modem implements a first version of a technical specification for the modem data transmission and reception[, and] the coprocessor implements a second version of the technical specification for the coprocessor data transmission

and reception.” In contrast, Vanghi ‘977 discloses that modem processor 210a implements UMTS, while modem processor 210b implements cdma2000. *See, e.g.*, Vanghi ‘977, Fig. 2; ¶¶ [0009], [0032]. UMTS and cdma2000 are different wireless network systems represented by *different* technical specifications. *See, e.g.*, Vanghi ‘977, ¶¶ [0005]-[0006], [0009]. Vanghi ‘977 discloses that all UMTS communication is handled by modem processor 210a and that all cdma2000 communication is handled by modem processor 210b. *See, e.g.*, Vanghi ‘977, Fig. 2; ¶¶ [0009], [0032]. Applicant’s claim 29, on the other hand, recites that the modem and the coprocessor implement different versions of the *same* technical specification for data transmission and reception. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 29 is not anticipated by the cited prior art.

Claims 30-35 depend from claim 29 and add further limitations. Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. Should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, however, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner telephone Applicant's Attorney, Ron Neerings, at 972-917-5299, so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. In the event that there are any fees due, please charge the same, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

January 2, 2009

Date

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218

/Brian A. Carlson/

Brian A. Carlson
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 37,793